

CLASSIFICATION OF GODONYMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES: LINGUOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

<https://doi.org/10.70728/phil.v05.i04.015>

Turdaliyeva Durdona Adhamovna
turdaliyevad336@gmail.com
UzSWLU

Abstract: Godonyms, as a subcategory of toponyms, represent street names that reflect the linguistic, cultural, and historical identity of a society. This study provides an in-depth comparative analysis of godonym classification in English and Uzbek languages from structural, semantic, functional, and linguocultural perspectives. The research employs qualitative and comparative methodologies, analyzing real examples from both linguistic contexts. The findings demonstrate that while English godonyms tend to emphasize geographical and descriptive features, Uzbek godonyms are strongly influenced by historical figures, ideological values, and national identity. The paper contributes to onomastic studies by offering a systematic and expanded classification model and highlighting the sociocultural significance of godonyms in shaping collective memory.

Keywords: Godonyms, Toponymy, Onomastics, Linguocultural Analysis, English, Uzbek, Street Names, Classification

Introduction. Toponymy is an essential branch of linguistics that investigates the origin, meaning, and use of place names. Among its subfields, godonym focuses specifically on street names, which function as both linguistic signs and cultural symbols. Street names are not merely tools for navigation; they encode valuable information about a society's history, political transformations, cultural priorities, and worldview.

In modern urban studies and linguistics, godonyms have gained importance due to rapid urbanization, globalization, and sociopolitical changes. Particularly in post-Soviet countries such as Uzbekistan, street naming practices have undergone significant transformations, reflecting shifts in ideology and national identity.

In English-speaking countries, godonyms often follow standardized patterns influenced by urban planning and geographical characteristics. In contrast, Uzbek godonyms frequently serve commemorative and ideological purposes, reflecting respect for historical figures, cultural heritage, and independence.

This study aims to:

- Develop an expanded classification of godonyms

- Compare English and Uzbek toponym systems
- Analyze their linguocultural significance

Literature Review. The study of place names has been extensively explored within onomastics. George R. Stewart classified place names into descriptive, associative, commemorative, and possessive categories, laying the foundation for modern toponymic studies.

Eilert Ekwall focused on the etymology and historical development of English place names, emphasizing the role of Old English and Norse influences.

In Slavic and post-Soviet contexts, Anna Superanskaya developed a general theory of proper names, highlighting their structural and functional aspects.

In Uzbek linguistics, scholars such as Shavkat Rahmatullayev and Toshpo‘lat Zohidov have contributed to the study of toponymy by analyzing semantic and cultural features of Uzbek place names.

Despite these contributions, comparative studies between English and Uzbek toponyms remain limited, particularly from a linguocultural perspective.

Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative, descriptive, and comparative approach.

Data Collection

- Street names from English-speaking countries (UK, USA)
- Street names from major Uzbek cities (e.g., Tashkent, Samarkand, Bukhara)

Methods of Analysis

- Structural analysis
- Semantic classification
- Functional analysis
- Linguocultural interpretation

Research Approach

The study applies a comparative framework to identify similarities and differences in naming patterns and their underlying cultural meanings.

Structural classification of toponyms (Extended analysis). Structurally, toponyms in both languages demonstrate systematic patterns influenced by grammar and syntax.

Simple toponyms. Simple forms consist of a single lexical element:

- English: *Park, Broadway*
- Uzbek: *Bog‘, Istiqlol*

These are less common and often historical in origin.

Compound toponyms. Compound structures dominate in both languages:

- English: *Oxford Street, Baker Street*
- Uzbek: *Amir Temur ko‘chasi, Navoiy ko‘chasi*

In Uzbek:

- Possessive suffixes (-i)
 - Genitive constructions
- play a significant role.

Complex godonyms. Complex names include multi-word expressions:

- English: *King George V Avenue*
- Uzbek: *Buyuk Ipak yo'li ko'chasi*

Uzbek godonyms tend to be longer due to agglutinative structure.

Morphological features. English: analytic structure (word order important)

- Uzbek: agglutinative structure (suffix-based meaning)

This difference significantly influences hodonym formation.

Semantic Classification (Deepened Analysis)

Anthroponymic godonyms. Highly dominant in Uzbek:

- *Amir Temur ko'chasi*
- *Alisher Navoiy ko'chasi*

English examples:

- *Churchill Avenue*

Uzbek reflects national pride, English reflects historical documentation.

Topographical Godonyms

- English: *Hill Street, River Road*
- Uzbek: *Tog' ko'chasi*

English usage is more frequent due to urban planning traditions.

Historical and political godonyms

Uzbek examples:

- *Mustaqillik ko'chasi*
- *Istiqlol yo'li*

These reflect post-independence ideology.

Economic and occupational godonyms

- English: *Market Street*
- Uzbek: *Dehqon bozori ko'chasi*

Reflect economic life and professions.

Discussion. The findings confirm that godonyms function as linguistic reflections of social structure and cultural values. While both languages share structural similarities, their semantic and functional priorities differ significantly.

The Uzbek system is more ideologically and culturally driven, whereas the English system is more pragmatic and descriptive.

Conclusion. The study of hodonyms in English and Uzbek languages demonstrates that street names are not mere practical tools for navigation; they are deeply intertwined with culture, history, and social identity. The comparative analysis revealed several key findings:

Structural similarities and differences: Both English and Uzbek hodonyms exhibit similar structural patterns such as simple, compound, and complex forms. However, the Uzbek language's agglutinative nature allows for more elaborate and morphologically rich hodonyms, while English tends to favor concise, analytic constructions. This structural difference reflects broader linguistic typologies and influences naming conventions.

Semantic and functional variations: Semantically, English hodonyms often emphasize geographical and descriptive aspects, such as topography, local landmarks, or occupation-related features (e.g., *Hill Street*, *Market Lane*). In contrast, Uzbek hodonyms are more ideologically and historically oriented, commemorating national heroes, political events, or cultural values (e.g., *Amir Temur ko'chasi*, *Mustaqillik yo'li*). Functionally, both systems serve identificational purposes, but Uzbek hodonyms carry additional commemorative, ideological, educational, and cultural functions, reinforcing collective memory and national identity.

Linguocultural significance: Hodonyms act as linguistic markers of cultural and national identity. The English system often reflects pragmatic urban planning and local history, whereas the Uzbek system is heavily influenced by socio-political changes, particularly post-independence. The renaming of streets after national figures and concepts in Uzbekistan demonstrates how language and naming practices are used to reconstruct historical consciousness and reinforce cultural pride.

Sociopolitical implications: Street naming is closely linked to societal changes and power structures. In Uzbekistan, the replacement of Soviet-era names with ones reflecting national heritage illustrates how hodonyms can serve as instruments of ideological and cultural transformation. English hodonyms, while historically layered, are less susceptible to rapid political change, emphasizing stability and continuity.

Educational and communicative roles: Hodonyms function as informal educational tools, introducing citizens to historical events, prominent figures, and cultural values. They also play a role in communication, navigation, and urban planning. In both languages, they offer opportunities for linguocultural learning, fostering awareness of the relationship between language and society.

Final Statement: In conclusion, hodonyms serve as windows into the cultural, historical, and ideological fabric of a society. While structural similarities exist across English and Uzbek systems, semantic, functional, and cultural differences highlight the unique linguistic and sociopolitical contexts of each language. By studying hodonyms comparatively, linguists, educators, and cultural historians can gain a deeper understanding of how language both reflects and shapes collective memory, identity, and cultural values. This research contributes to the broader field of onomastics and underscores the significance of integrating linguocultural perspectives into the study of toponyms.

References

1. Stewart, G. R. (1954). Names on the Land.
2. Ekwall, E. (1960). The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names.
3. Superanskaya, A. V. (1973). General Theory of Proper Names.
4. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2010). O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati.
5. Zohidov, T. (2005). Toponimika asoslari.
6. Nicolaisen, W. F. H. (1976). Scottish Place-Names.
7. Crystal, D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language.
8. Alimuhamedov, A. (2018). O‘zbek toponimiyasi tadqiqotlari.